

In attendance: Ray Williams, VP Access & Academic Affairs (RW); Neil Misra, VP Graduates (NM); Nick Entwistle, External Trustee (NE); Anisha Faruk, Chair/President (AF); Kaya Axelsson, VP Charities and Community (KA); India Jordan, External Trustee (IJ); Róisín McCallion, VP Welfare and Equal Opportunities (RMC); Grace Davis, Student Trustee (GD) - arrived later on; Sarah Owen, External Trustee (SO) - present via phone; Amber Sparks, VP Women (AS); Mathew Judson, Deputy Chair/Student Trustee (MJ).

Also in attendance: Ryan Bird, Chief Executive Officer (RB); Sarah Bradley, Deputy Chief Executive (SB) - joins for Paper 6

Minutes taken by Lily Johnson, Executive Assistant (LJ)

	Item	Actions
1.	<p>Apologies</p> <p>None</p>	
2.	<p>Conflicts of Interest</p> <p>None</p>	
3.	<p>Minutes from previous meeting</p> <p>Approved</p>	
4.	<p>Matters arising from previous meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AF: goes through the actions from the previous meeting - Finance Committee to meet again and involve new Sabbs – RB all went ahead - Election report with Sabb survey – done - Accessibility of website – VP WEO and IJ to talk, info given and full DAS audit of website as part of accessibility on the whole - Impact reports updated by previous Sabbs - OSSSL directors to meet and take on Board recommendations; OxStu now accounted not as commercial expenditure but as student development income in its primary purpose – although if it does make commercial income from advertising it will go through the company - 3-year strategy and changing the way we work in this area, from Jan will focus on longer term approach for income generation 	
5.	<p>CEO Report</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RB: I will be leaving the organisation in the New Year; AF: to discuss this after report - RB: successful welcome period. In good place currently, updated staffing structure and staff vacancies in HFOE and Policy and Change – hiring for these. Staff structure has been the priority over summer - RB: 4 leavers, 2 new starts (one is interim, the other is short-term but may extend) - RB: annual plan – one single plan. Worked with Sabbs (new + old) on this. At the end of term, the staff will review; SO: really pleased with how condensed plan has come together 	<p>By Wednesday, following internally discussions, AF to send out details of interim to Board. Board to be able to contact RB for discussions about this.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none">- RB: strategic discussions from Away Day – important to have scenario planning going forward, helpful with budget- RB: also included objectives but will park these for now but will want to review for us in interim and for future post holder- RB: finance – looking at larger deficit that planned from HR costs and redundancy payments – changes will deliver savings in long term. <p>GD arrives</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">- RB: Budget challenge meetings arranged with managers – reforecasting in Jan- RB: income going well- JH: will be scoping about what a break-even budget could look like – discussed in Finance Committee. RB: discussions with University about block grant. If not increased this would need to be implemented – staffing implications- RB: auditors been in and seem satisfied. Finance Committee meeting in couple of weeks where all of board are welcome to sign it off- NE: how is income for advertising down but income from commercial sources said to be up? RB: last year vs this year’s projection. We are looking to increase this year.- RB: would like to thank everyone – has had a fantastic time here. Was looking to leave in next year-18 months because of long commute but then opportunity at Reading came up. Two bits to cover: 1. interim plan; 2. recruiting successor. AF and RB have discussed 1 in detail- JH: would like to hear interim plan- AF and RB agree that given SB is Deputy CEO she would be most appropriate. Would Board be happy with this?- IJ: has she said she is happy to do that? RB: no formal discussions but she is interested on the basis of discussions. With right support it would work – with JH acknowledge potential costs of this- RMC: problem with staffing changes already leaving gaps plugged but SB and RB but not sustainable with SB covering RB. Too much for one person – impossible task. RB: yes, need backfill support and professional support.- AF: RB to leave end of Jan and new Senior Manager should have been appointed by then to deputise- NE: should look at other option to make sure make conscious decision. Easier to hire interim CEO than comms (comms agency will not give you what you want). What makes in house solution better? Question we can and do need to answer. Need to make sure also that detailed handover is forgotten because of this. Task-level handover needed.- KA: we are suffering in comms currently. If anywhere we could bring in extra support, it would be comms- NE: have any other plans been looked at? For handover + continuity. Conversation just from this morning. SB as CEO making sure these points have been considered, Graham supporting with learning, and backfilling comms. RMC: not just comms but other areas too- KA: university comms could come to review our processes. Good people we could work with, Increase communication in our office. Much better than agency. RB: agrees. Sounds sensible and has happened in the past.- JH: budget side and discussions with Uni – how will there be continuity? RB: SB has been part of those discussions and meeting about our request	<p>Also by Weds will decide working group on this. External member and student to join these discussions based on priorities.</p> <p>RB to write entire, detailed CEO business cycle, including detail on time spent.</p> <p>RB to produce details on other possible</p>
--	---

	<p>will happen early Jan when I am still here.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NE: need to write down entire CEO business cycle, skills, knowledge, quals, nitty gritty boring procedural process work and what time spent doing what. This will help us not setting someone up to fail. Buy help. We are org that is growing – need to keep strategic projects on track and make sure not changed. Detailed lists are key to make it clear. Recruitment and interim to think about. Other qs about changing internal comms might need to be parked for a few months. KA: but we interface with students and so we need to keep it up. - IJ: feels this is all a bit quick and don't want to rush it in a decision about what happens. Feels like it's too hasty to make a decision today. RMC: agrees but worried about timescale. RB: could look at other models and get that done quickly (by middle next week). JH: too many gaps, need some time thinking through. AF: external Board member to also be part of the discussion? NE: depending what trying to get out of recruitment. That changes who we want. RB: yes, will look into this. - NE: thank you and congrats to RB - AF: to make clear Board will have final say, oversee working group - MJ: time frame? RB: can come back on it next week 	
<p>6.</p>	<p>Clubs and Societies Paper</p> <p>SB joins meeting</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - SB: background to paper is that it has been talked about for a long time. We are asking Board for steer on whether we take over completely or partner with Uni. Will vastly change scope of Student Engagement. Also commensurate with rest of sector. Problems in reluctance to change. Governance and admin can be brought to Board – using precedent. Would affect strategic plan and change scope of the SU - RMC: was in meeting the other day where it was talked about as if it was going to happen. - IJ: question about scope of the definition of club and soc – e.g. does this include sports? SB: no just clubs and socs. At first just ones with university name who are already registered with the proctors. IJ: how many? SB: at the moment we have 250 on directory but hard to know because Proctors still do admin with paper - RMC: came up in Prevent committee of the problem of unregistered clubs and socs. They were enthusiastic that more people would want to register with SU – more approachable - MJ: what are barriers with Proctors? SB: pretty much just reluctance to change. They worry about handing over power of Uni name - JH: worried about us taking it on right now when it is beyond our scope. AS: problem with staff cuts already and who this can be resourced. SB: will need business case and full analysis and where our focus needs to be. IJ also worries about cost-benefit at this time. JH would not want to do this without budget increase to help us commit to doing it well. - GD: worries about involvement of with political groups and charity. NE: can be avoided. RB: to do with how they are considered in relation to charity - GD: finances? SB: banking system where we can audit them while making sure that the soc is in charge of the money - JH: need governance rules and need arrangements for how they are formed. Need paperwork to know how we do this. 	<p>Develop business plan and governance framework to support Clubs and Societies.</p> <p>Eventual full takeover of clubs and socs but this might not be where we will go now.</p> <p>SB and Student Engagement to continue discussions with University.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Question of how to fund them properly and how to help with developing them. RB: does not think that they are willing to give more money. - SB: partnership or full take over – what is the direction from Board? Just admin, or risk too? - RMC: we can't offer all the things uni does e.g. IT systems, using name/brand, transport. SB: it is using brand that that is biggest sticking point with them at the moment - Ultimate end of being full control agreed on by all but worries about readiness for it now and whether this is right time - RB: this is not currently part of Block Grant negotiation but should be stand-alone part. JH: does not want uncertainty about this to delay block grant. - RB: need to be sensitive about language used externally – not a “takeover” but improving running clubs and socs. AS: will this result in redundancy in Proctor's office. JH: Sports clubs? SB: run by Sports Fed <p>SB leaves</p>	
7.	<p>New SU Building</p> <p>MJ becomes Chair</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AF introduces paper – context, discussions that have been held, and benefits for this. Questions in paper for Board to consider. In particular: what are Board's requirements for new SU space? Estates Services happy to help us once requirements clarified. - RB: broader conversation about where central student services will be – new humanities centre, Cambridge has centralised it. AF: move in next 5 year-ish but need to start conversation early - JH: need to think about where we will be in future. Not so keen on commercial buildings as unsure of poss of success of these. Central student services currently popular. RMC: more space that, like Sheffield + Nottingham put commercial things like hole in the wall. NE: middle ground between commercial and not. But also need to look at having meeting rooms etc. for us. - RMC: would be good to have place people can come and work. Also, central location - GD: people don't know it's here. IJ: only walk past to station. RMC: making sure it is not just another part of the University - AF: how do we demonstrate demand from students for a new space? - MJ: offering clubs and socs space? GD: meeting rooms booked out a lot. RB: buzz about the place grown this year. Should ask students what they want. Also track building usage <p>AF re-assumes Chair</p>	<p>Keep tracking use of rooms in current building so we have data on it.</p> <p>Survey students to get their opinion on what is needed.</p>
8.	<p>Governance Matters</p> <p>a. Article Review Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RW gives a summary of the meeting of the review group. Main thing is expanding definition of who counts as represented by us. No longer auto-resignation if someone stops being a student as student trustee. Also, referenda: not changing numbers required but changing how we decide 	<p>Will not bring motion to Council next term but seek to get full picture of all changes before doing this.</p>

<p>numbers for it</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IJ: reviewed and think they are mostly good. Some we should get formal legal advice e.g. bits where it have been deleted for being copying law, and making only trustees responsible for organistaion. Not big legal thing – just advice. RB: last time legal advice cost £30,000. IJ: just this is plan, just approve and be really clear with what we want - NE: worry about entering into battle with Council. RW: no strong feelings in Council. RB: operationally will make more sense - AF: will also go to Council. IJ: need to make sure we are not overstepping mark - MJ: this is an unusual step but what council would like <p>b. Sabbatical Role Remits</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - NE: declare conflict of interest – author of review is his friend - AF: Sabbs in general agreement that VP Women is outdated – would prefer broader “VP Liberation”. Also, any general comments on Sabb role remits? - MJ: what is the knock on? RMC: Equal Opps moved from WEO to make Welfare VP. Already liaises with AS on Equal Opps stuff. AS: would balance number of committees that WP Women sit on. Balancing workload. - NE: just a warning that once post deleted then will not be able to bring it back. Would not be able to have limited franchise officer in future. - AS: difficulty for identification of role. RMC: Brookes has committee of identity reps overseen by VP. KA: we close big gap for uni with training in consent workshops. - AS: more hesitant in her support of the change not NE’s point has been considered. RMC also hesitant. RMC: this set up works because AS and I get on and don’t want to let that cloud judgement. - GD: could we specify that person has to identify as group to run. NE: could not limit franchise of new officer. Can do this in a soft way but think it might raise questions under 1994 Act. MJ: can encourage to run and vote to fulfil liberation purpose of role - GD: assume not position based on identification. Issues with running consent workshops etc. when not done by woman – esp in comparison to cis man. RMC: this is concern people have with her role with Equal Opps - RW: which committees would VP Liberation sit on – E+D committees. AS: giving VP Welfare more space to focus on Welfare. RW: worries about overlap with Access etc. - RW current remits don’t reflect what happens - Decide not to make a decision on VP Women because will not hit this election cycle anyway (needs to be passed by two councils) and NE’s point raises new concerns. RB: helpful to inform more detailed discussions to pull together in HT to make decision - AF: further changes to remit? KA: suggestion to make VP Charities and Community, “Climate and Community”. 3 reasons: 1. Charity done by RAG and role is systemic and charity not systemic change but plugging gap; 2. Big part of role is now Climate, followed by Community (community partnerships are now more charity part); 3. asking Uni to make big changes for Climate, important to make stand too + dedicate person to climate - NE: No one can stop you focusing on what you want to focus on. The purpose of job title is to give some direction to people not knowing about it. Best to keep role titles broad. RMC: agrees with this. Need it to be 	<p>Sabbs to discuss what to do with former campaigns. Loop RB in to put staff time on it to listen to and address concerns.</p>
---	--

	<p>flexible to follow student priorities. KA: Really important climate should be focus going forward. RW agrees with RMC – wide variety of interests for social action valid for candidates to decide to prioritise when run, the steer to climate from students voting not from us naming roles. E.g. like renaming VP WEO VP Mental Health</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – NM: would like to expand role title of VP Grads to VP Grads and Internationals. Already in his remit just highlighting it. All agree with this – This needs to go as motion to Council, then back to Board, then back to council, then back to board – MJ: Two questions: reducing Sabb numbers? Should Clubs and Socs fit into role remits? – AF: in response to 1, this is discussion most appropriate after budget discussions with University. RB: don't want to just make piecemeal changes but a holistic change <p>JH leaves</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – AS: for record all against reduction in Sabb numbers unless really needed – AF: summary – hesitant to change VP Women to Liberation, keen to change VP Grads, broadly do not support changing VP C+C <p>c. Campaign Update</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – AF: purpose of this to primarily loop in external and student trustees: Campaigns Review passed last year but lots of backlash against this. Some student groups that were SU campaigns e.g. Climate Justice and Living Wage, no longer official campaigns and don't like "demotion" to projects, also not as short term as projects. Projects have been popular but want to create new status for these campaigns that have lost out and take this to Student Council and have hust – AS: problem that student groups don't have things that work for them <i>now</i>. So next term It Happens Here are bringing a motion to become Sectional Campaign as they represent self-identifying group of sexual violence survivors. Not all campaigns can do this but need short term things. AF: could give them institutional SU support from Hilary once we have passed this. Seems like they should fall under this other category – To be discussed further in Sabb meeting – MJ: Seems like when this was passed, it was not fully understood as little opposition then – communication problem 	
<p>9.</p>	<p>Committee Reports</p> <p>a. People and Culture</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – NE gives review of P+C meeting. Chaired this meeting and keen not to in future – Key Board level concern is that Board might not be able to complete plan. Also, People and Culture and Finance need to be clear which bits rest with each, in particular in compliance and risk. <p>b. Finance and Risk</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> – RB speaks to this – Agrees with NE that importance of tying up with People and Culture, given staffing is key expenditure 	<p>Remits for People and Culture Committee and Finance and Risk Committee to be clearly separated in their remits.</p>

	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - IJ: question about potential savings of staff. RB: would need some of saving for 80k elsewhere but would ultimately be helped a lot by 2 fewer people on pay roll <p>c. OSSL Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AS gives summary of OSSL Board meeting <p>d. Media Board</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RW gives summary of media activities. Ideas to be presented next term 	
10.	<p>AOB</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AF: reminder to fill out form LJ sent round for World Pay - AF: Board also to note that she has been mandated by Council to write open letter standing in solidarity with protesters in HK and condemning police brutality. Sabbs all supportive of motion however a lot of students opposed to motion but largely not voters. Another motion being brought to 7th week council also asking AF to condemn protester violence. Also risk to reputation. Looking for advice from Board about how to navigate this - IJ: how many students? AS: possibly 100 <p>RB leaves</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - AF: maybe 30 students there at Council and more not there; NE: not new challenges in showing solidarity with other students. Should be careful about commenting on nation state, actors within nation state, and nationals of that state – this can be applied to many scenarios. For China and HK should make targeted and specific by following will of Council - AS: concerns also raised about racial tensions in relation to this, from both sides. Difficult to balance. <p>RB re-enters</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - RB: 300 signatures received for Council to be re-called. Happy to wait until 7th week Council if letter not published - AF: would like approval of wording in circulated draft letter from Board - IJ: have we thought hard about whether this falls within objects of the SU? Need to be careful with political aim being in the interests of students of the university. Or else whole Board could be challenged on this. KA: could be more targeted in way we acknowledge friends and family involved directly in this to make fit with objectives (family and friends who are subject to police brutality) - KA: Amnesty International rep would like solidarity wall in the SU. MJ: have recourse to council mandating them. IJ: worries still about not fulfilling object, large body of students who think it is against. RMC: student on year abroad in HK? - KA: signposting to services – advice, counselling, harassment. IJ: can put this neutrally so anyone affected – whether HK Chinese or mainland Chinese. Legal risk. - Agree to err on side of linking to students as much as possible - Tactical conversations to be had around what actions other SUs are taking e.g. also a problem at Cambridge right now 	<p>AF to re-draft letter to make it more specific to students, in consultation with IJ.</p> <p>Hold off publishing letter until after 7th week Council.</p> <p>To look at what others SUs are doing.</p>

Oxford SU Trustee Board
15th November 2020, 1pm (MT 19)
Oxford SU, 4 Worcester Street, Oxford OX1 2BX.
Charity number: 1140687
Company number: 07314850



	RB leaves	
11.	Date of next meeting – Noted as Friday 15 th February	
12.	Board Development and Reflection – All agree proposals needed to be more specific. Otherwise a good job capturing actions etc. – Realise SO is no longer on the line – unsure as to when it disconnected	Ensure papers for next time are more specific. Look into better conference call options.